

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-15 and 24-43 are pending in the present application after the amendment herein. Claims 12 and 24, formerly dependent claims, have been rewritten in independent form, incorporating all limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

Claims 1-11 and 16-23 have been herein cancelled. The subject matter of dependent claims 2-10 and 18-22 have been represented as new claims 30-43 dependent upon the new independent claims 12 and 24: new claims 30-34 correspond to the subject matter of cancelled claims 18-22; while new claims 35-43 correspond to the subject matter of cancelled claims 2-10.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 12 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,002,941 to Ablay et al. (herein referred to as the "Ablay patent") in view of an abstract entitled "From SIBS to Distributed Objects: A Transformative Approach to Service Creation," by Elie Najm et al. (herein referred to as the "Najm reference") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,646 to Jellema et al. (herein referred to as the "Jellema patent"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner cites the Ablay patent as teaching "graphical blocks" and a "service logic script", citing col. 2, lines 57-67, column 7, lines 29-64 and column 5, lines 38-67. Applicants respectfully disagree. The "service building blocks" discussed in the Ablay patent neither disclose nor suggest the "graphical language blocks" as claimed in the present invention. The "graphical language blocks" as recited in the original claims 1-15 refers to the particular abstraction devised by the inventors, referred to in the specification as "Language Graphical Objects" or "LGOs". As described in the specification in more detail, "graphical language blocks" "represent service control and call control primitive functions" and they "pass a token to their next object(s) at certain points, as determined by their internal logic, during their execution." Summary of Invention, Page 2, Lines 13-23. Claim 12, amended into independent form, essentially recites these limitations and makes clear that the term "graphical language block" refers to a different type of service creation abstraction. Claim 12 recites that the "graphical language blocks each represent service control or call control functions" wherein "each block has at least one input or output for passing a token between the blocks".

The "service logic script" in the present claims represents assembled "graphical language blocks". Thus, since the Ablay patent does not disclose "graphical language blocks" as claimed in claim 12, it also does not disclose "graphical language blocks" assembled into a "service logic

script.” Nor does it disclose or suggest “translating said graphical language blocks into programming language objects when said service logic script is installed and executed.”

The Najm reference is cited by the Examiner as teaching “translat[ion] into a java like language (page 1).” The Najm reference, which notably is undated, merely indicates that a service independent block can be translated into a “Java like language” in a “correctness-preserving transformation” with no further description. There is no disclosure that a “graphical language block” – rather than a “service independent block” – is translated into “programming language objects when said service logic script is installed and executed.”

The Examiner cites to the Albay patent at column 9, lines 38-45 and column 12, lines 60-67 as teaching a “token.” The Albay patent does not refer to or suggest “passing a token” between “graphical language blocks”. Rather, the Albay patent speaks to application programming interface (API) messages that invokes a “service building block” in the context of the actual invocation of the service in the service execution environment. The “graphical language blocks” in the present invention, as mentioned above, are translated into “programming language objects” before execution in a “service execution environment”. As further mentioned in claim 36 (replacing and representing the same subject matter as cancelled claim 3), the service control and call control functions of the “graphical language blocks” are mapped into service control and call control functions of the “application programming interfaces (APIs), which are exposed in the service execution environment.” The API messages discussed in the Albay patent, at best, correspond to the “event notifications” in the “service execution environment” referred to in claims 37 and 38. Thus, the API messages discussed in the Albay patent do not teach or suggest the “tokens” passed in between the “graphical language blocks”—since they are transferred at a different level of abstraction in the service creation system.

The Albay patent and the Jellema patent both appear to be directed to adapting intelligent network concepts, such as service independent building blocks (SIBs), specifically to the context of wireless communications. The present invention, on the other hand, utilizes a different abstraction, the “LGO”, which, in accordance with a preferred embodiment, is suited for utilization for subscribers to IP telephony and multimedia services.

Accordingly, new independent claim 12 is believed to be allowable over the references cited.

Claims 13-15 and 35-43 are dependent upon claim 12 and, accordingly, are also believed to be allowable.

With respect to claim 24, now rewritten in independent form, the Examiner relies again on the above reasoning with respect to claim 12. For similar reasons, claim 24 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Claim 24 recites "an editor for providing graphical capability to create a service logic script for a desired service using language graphical objects" wherein the "language graphical objects" "each represent control or call control functions and wherein each block has at least one input or output for passing a token between blocks". As argued above, the "language graphical objects" similarly represent a different type of abstraction than the service building blocks discussed in the Albay patent.

Claims 25-34 are dependent upon claim 24 and, accordingly, are also believed to be allowable.


Conclusion

Applicants have addressed the rejections of the Examiner and, accordingly, a timely notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 908-532-1904 to discuss any matter concerning the application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C. F. R. 1.16 and 1.17 to **AT&T Corp. Deposit Account No. 01-2745**.

Respectfully submitted,
Siroos K. Afshar et al.

Date: April 29, 2003

By 
Benjamin S. Lee
Reg. No. 42,787

AT&T CORP.
P.O. Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748
Tel: 908-532-1904
Fax: 732-368-6932